Hansen, Janette

From: Hansen, Janette

Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 10:14 AM

To: Greenhagen, Andrew

Subject: RE: MPO

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Completed

The answer is "all of the above." This interval gives them the option of mining more than they initially proposed, saving us from a modification later on, and the confining zone for this larger interval is "stronger" than what would have been designated with just the original mining interval. Yes, this thicker interval would still have been there, "confining", but this helps more with public perception.

From: Greenhagen, Andrew

Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 9:59 AM

To: Hansen, Janette < hansen.janette@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: MPO

Another one for you: Ted's app proposes to mine the A-1, but the draft permit is written to allow mining up into the A-2. Did he submit something asking for this or did it come up in discussion btwn you and he, or was there a hydrogeologic reason? Was your choice of 7160 for the IZ top based upon leaving 150 of cavern roof salt assuming the formation top is about 7010?

Thanks!

From: Hansen, Janette

Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 3:35 PM

To: Greenhagen, Andrew < Greenhagen. Andrew@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: MPO

Trying to remember – I think the casing inspection logs, SAPTs, and W-BITs were taking their place. The idea was to catch problems before they were leaks. See what you think.

I think I got the idea from other Regions and states.

From: Greenhagen, Andrew

Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 3:27 PM

To: Hansen, Janette < hansen.janette@epa.gov>

Subject: MPO

Hi,

In looking at the draft permit that you prepared for MPO, was there a reason that Part 1 and 2 MIT demonstrations were not required every 5 years?

Andrew Greenhagen Underground Injection Control Branch U.S. EPA - Region 5 (312) 353-7648